

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 11, 2009, claims 1, 5-12, 14-17 and 26 have been amended. Claims 19-25 have been withdrawn and claims 2-4 and 18 have been canceled. Claims 1, 5-17 and 26 are pending in the application.

In paragraph 10 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-17 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Seto.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claims. .

Applicant respectfully submit that Seto et al. fail to teach every element of claims 1 and 26 as amended.

Independent claim 1 sets forth referencing an object by selected indicia defining a location of the object on a network, the selected indicia being a globally-unique network identifier or a globally-unique network identifier and an object locator, searching for the object at the location defined by the selected indicia, downloading the object from the location defined by the selected indicia, analyzing the downloaded object to identify the selected indicia of the downloaded object and capturing the object in persistent memory when the selected indicia is identified to include a globally-unique network identifier. Independent claim 26 sets forth similar elements.

Seto discloses a data file unit 200 that stores image data and various tables associated with object images, latitude/longitude-line/pixel conversion coefficients, etc. A user provides an object name to retrieve the longitude and latitude of an object by using an object table. When an image corresponding to the entered object name is found, object information (i.e., longitude and latitude) is retrieved. An image identification number is retrieved from an image table using longitude and latitude provided by the longitude and latitude retrieving process. For example, an image table

stores a sensor name, sensed data, longitude and latitude of the four corners of a sensed image, and an image identification number, a sensed image is identified wherein the longitude and latitude of the object are within an area defined by the longitude and latitude of the four corners of the sensed image and the image identification number and image information of the sensed image is then retrieved. The retrieved image ID number is then used to retrieve an object image.

Thus, according to Seto, the longitude and latitude defines a geographic location of a place, but the longitude and latitude does not define the location of the object on a network, i.e., the location of the image.

The longitude and latitude provide a geographic address, but are not a globally-unique network identifier.

Seto discloses that a database contains images and that an image ID number is then used to retrieve the image. However, neither the image ID number nor the longitude and latitude define the location of the object. As explained above, the longitude and latitude merely describe a geographic location that may be viewed in a particular image. The image ID number is not a globally-unique network identifier. Moreover, the image ID number is used to simply cross-reference to an image in a database. However, the image ID number does not define the location of the image. For example, the image ID number does not identify the table or the particular cell in the database that the image is located.

In view of the above, Seto does not describe downloading the object from the location defined by the selected indicia, analyzing the downloaded object to identify the selected indicia of the downloaded object and capturing the object in persistent memory when the selected indicia is identified to include a globally-unique network identifier.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 26 are patentable over Seto.

Dependent claims 5-17 are also patentable over the cited reference, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 1. Further dependent claims 5-17 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicants reserve the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 5-18 are patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 865-380-5976. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725 for any additional fee required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(865) 380-5976
Date: December 11, 2009



By: _____
Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204